

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

TANANGELA N. ANDERSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No. 16-cv-02652-STA-tmp
)	
TENNESSEE QUADEL CONSULTING CORPORATION, a Tennessee corporation, and JOHN DOES 1 through 20 inclusive,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Before the Court is Defendant Tennessee Quadel Consulting Corporation's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 54) filed February 2, 2018. Defendant seeks the dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint for failure to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). For cause Defendant cites the fact that on January 2, 2018, the Court granted then-counsel for Plaintiff's motion to withdraw. At that time Plaintiff's former counsel notified the Court that Plaintiff had stopped returning his calls even though the parties were actively negotiating a settlement of the dispute. Under the circumstances, the Court found good cause to allow counsel to withdraw. The Court also continued the trial, which was set to begin January 8, 2018. The Court gave Plaintiff 30 days in which to find replacement counsel or elect to proceed *pro se*. But Plaintiff failed to show that she had hired counsel or give any other notice to Defendant or the Court within the time allowed. Defendant therefore requests that the Court dismiss the case for Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's order.

On February 12, 2018, ten days after Plaintiff's deadline had passed, replacement counsel entered notices of appearance on Plaintiff's behalf (ECF Nos. 55, 56). The same day the Court received a letter (ECF No. 58) from Plaintiff stating that she had been in touch with attorneys about possibly taking her case and that she would notify the Court once she had found new counsel. In the three weeks since new counsel filed their appearances, Plaintiff has not responded to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, and the time for a response has now passed. And Plaintiff has not filed any other requests for relief with the Court nor otherwise taken any action to prosecute her case, despite the fact that Plaintiff filed suit in August 2016 and the Court had to continue the trial.

Therefore, Plaintiff is ordered to show cause as to why the Court should not grant Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for her failure to prosecute this action. Plaintiff's response to the show cause order is due by the close of business on Monday, March 12, 2018. Failure to respond by that deadline will be deemed good grounds to grant Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. THOMAS ANDERSON
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: March 5, 2018